

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,542,106 to Krenz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,554,996 to Chatzipetros. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Krenz in view of Chatzipetros does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious “a first antenna element, provided in the first casing; a conductor element, provided in the second casing *to form a dipole antenna together with the first antenna element*,” as required. In an example embodiment set forth in the specification, with reference to Fig. 1, it is explained on page 17, lines 15-17 that “In this case, the plate shaped conductor 4 and the ground plate 6 operate as, for instance, a dipole antenna of half-wavelength.” As can be seen in Fig. 1, the plate shaped conduct (4) is located in an upper case (1) and the ground plate (6) is located in a lower case (2).

Krenz discloses an antenna (105) within a first housing element (101). An antenna (105) located in the first housing element (101) is a half-wave dipole comprising a conductive plate (107), a first terminal (108), another conductive plate (109) and a second terminal (110). All of the elements of the dipole antenna (105) are located within the first housing element (101). Krenz does appear to disclose another antenna located a second housing element (103). There is no disclosure anywhere in Krenz that the antenna (105) cooperates *together* with other antenna that is located in the second housing element (103) to form a dipole antenna. Therefore, Krenz does not disclose a first antenna element in a first casing *and* a conductor element in a second

casing, which *together* form a dipole, as required by claim 1. There is no suggest, motivation, or other reason why it would be obvious to modify the teachings of Krenz to provide part of the dipole antenna (105) in the second housing element (103). Further, Chatzipetros does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the limitations of which Krenz is deficient. Therefore, since every limitation of the claim is not taught, suggested or otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references, claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Further, since claims 2-22 depend from claim 1, they too are patentable for the same reasons.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-37395.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/  
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700  
October 17, 2007